



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	Sierra Resource Conservation District	<b>County</b>	Tulare
<b>Project Title</b>	Improving Groundwater Management in the Southern Sierra Fractured Bedrock Aquifer	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 108,220.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 119,220.00

**Project Description:** The Project executes a focused groundwater study, in the southern Sierra fractured bedrock aquifer, to provide critical information to enable greater local management of groundwater. Information gathered supports the groundwater portion of the region's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	0
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	2
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>23</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant does not have an adopted GWMP in place, but is in the process of developing one as part of its IRWMP. The proposed study area is not within a groundwater basin. Applicant does not discuss that the GWMP component will be completed and adopted within 2 years after the applicant's resolution of intention to prepare a GWMP. A copy of such resolution is not provided either.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The project description provided by the applicant is not complete and lacks details. The objective of the proposed project is to improve groundwater management by executing a focused groundwater study in the southern Sierra Nevada fractured bedrock aquifer. The proposed study area is Three Rivers, California, and is not within a groundwater basin. Additional documentation would have strengthened the project description. For example, the project description states county general plans call for development in the foothill communities that rely almost exclusively on fractured-rock aquifers, and mentions that the region is supported by a number of public districts, including Three Rivers Community Services District, Springville Public Utilities District, several small water associations, many private ditch companies, etc. A more detailed map of the proposed study area and maps showing the locations of water systems in the proposed study area (identifying the water system and designating if the source of supply is surface water or groundwater) and locations of private wells in the study area would have been useful.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The work plan describes in sufficient detail what will be done and what the product will be. It is divided into 9 tasks. The tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget, and supports the primary objective of the proposal, which is data collection and evaluation. The work plan lacks detailed maps. In the well yield and pumpage portion of the proposed study, the work plan indicates public wells, such as school sites, and up to 5 private wells have been identified for the study. However, there is no map showing the locations of these wells. Also, a more detailed map showing the boundaries of the proposed study area would have been useful. The application does not discuss alternatives, if the private well owners decide not to participate in the study or if the well information that is available does not meet the needs of the study. A strategy for evaluating the progress and performance of the project is not discussed.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. According to the amounts entered in BMS, the total project cost is \$119,220; the in-kind contribution is \$11,000; and the amount requested \$108,220. Using the values in Table 3, the Non-State Share for Task 1 (\$2,500) appears to have been added twice, and the amount for Travel, Materials and Supplies (\$400) was not added to the Total. Based on Table 3 values, the total project cost should be \$116,720, of which \$8,500 is the in-kind contribution. Some of the items in the budget appear to be based on hourly rates, and some appear to be for completion of a task or report. No explanation is provided of how the hourly pay rates, the number of hours allocated for the tasks, or the costs for a task were determined. The budget does not include any supporting documentation for hydrogeology work. The application indicates Kenneth Schmidt (hydrogeologist and geologist) presented a scope of work to the Southern Sierra Regional Water Management Group for studies in the Southern Sierra to understand groundwater, but this scope of work is not included in the application. The budget is consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule and shows cost-share and grant-share amounts broken down by tasks.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The application shows a proposed start date of January 3, 2013, and a proposed end date of March 31, 2015. The start and end dates are not within the PSP-designated time frame. The PSP instructed the applicant to assume a realistic start date for its proposed project of no sooner than April 2013, and anticipated a maximum 2-year performance period. The length of the proposed project is 2 ¼ years. According to the schedule, for the last quarter the only task that is not administrative or involving informing stakeholders, is the preparation of the final report. If the scheduled tasks were compressed a little, and the start date moved back, the project could fit the PSP-designated time frame. Although the timelines agree with the work plan sequencing and the budget, the schedule will need to be shortened by 3 months to meet the PSP-designated time frame. The applicant's proposed start date was several months before the PSP-recommended earliest start date, suggesting that the applicant will be ready to proceed as soon as funding becomes available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete and insufficient. Much of this project involves assembling, reviewing, and interpreting existing information, determining where data gaps exist, and when needed, conducting monitoring (groundwater elevations and some water quality) to fill the data gaps. However, procedural assurances, QA/QC plans for field sampling and laboratory analysis, or use of standardized methodologies and standardized analyses are not discussed in the application. The QA/QC measures are not incorporated in the work plan either. The applicant only provides a list of the project partners and discusses professional qualifications of the personnel who will be involved in the project.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant describes one previous project, a community groundwater program for the unincorporated towns of Prather, Auberry, and Tollhouse, which focused on determining the groundwater conditions of a populated area within the Sierra Nevada foothill region of eastern Fresno County and was funded by a \$50,000 grant from DWR's Local Groundwater Assistance Program. The applicant also describes projects funded by the Natural Resources Conservation Service to fund upgrades of two school water systems (installation of a replacement transducer for determining static wells levels and installation of flow meters), and states that all projects funded by DWR and other California Agencies have been successfully completed to budget. However, the applicant did not provide any copies of past performance evaluations or specific examples of how tasks were completed within the allotted time or within the budget.